

CWP-18032-2014
Date of Decision : 24.03.2017

Versus

The petitioner was selected as heavy vehicle driver but was not allowed to join since the respondents initially came to the conclusion that his licence was fake. In response to the present petition reply has been filed. On the basis thereof Assistant Advocate General has accepted that even as per record originally a valid licence was issued to the petitioner in the year 1990 but as per her there is no explanation for the change in number. Counsel for the petitioner has stated that petitioner was working in CRPF and it was during his service that he had obtained original driving licence in the year 1990 and thereafter the licence was renewed from time to time at different places where the petitioner happened to be posted. He says that if the respondents grant him one opportunity he would be able to explain all the doubts which may have existed. On behalf of the

CWP-18032-2014

respondents Assistant Advocate General has very fairly accepted that since even as per the official record the original licence issued to the petitioner was valid there may be some explanation for the change of the number. As per her if the petitioner moves self contained representation to respondent No.2, the respondent No.2 shall take a decision thereon and would also hear the petitioner if the petitioner so desires and will peruse whatever record the petitioner may produce.

In the circumstance, this petition is disposed of with direction to the petitioner to move a representation with all the records which he may want to produce before the respondent No.2 within 3 months from today(to enable him to collect all the documents) and respondent No.2 shall decide the same within further period of 3 months and in case it is found that the petitioner has been able to satisfy the requirements, would issue him the appointment order within the same period and in case petitioner is found suitable for employment he would be granted all consequential benefits except salary and allowances for the period he was not in service.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending Civil Misc. Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

24.03.2017
anuradha

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned - Yes/No

Whether reportable - Yes/No